



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,563	11/19/2001	Joseph C. Sher	MICRON.113C1	2553

20995 7590 08/27/2002

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 91614

EXAMINER

TRA, ANH QUAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2816

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/989,563

Applicant(s)

SHER ET AL.

Examiner

Quan Tra

Art Unit

2816

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Terry D. Cunningham  
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the statements in page 2, second paragraph and the paragraph between page 2 and page 3, it is inherent that diode<sup>a</sup> is a clamp circuit. Furumochi's diodes forcing the output node to be at a certain level (the total threshold voltages of diodes connected in series) with any value of the supply voltage ( $V_{cc}$ ) that higher than the total threshold voltage of the diodes. Therefore, Furumochi's diodes can be considered as a clamp circuit because the diodes force or limit the output voltage to be at the total of threshold of diodes connected in series.

In response to the statement "Neither Javanifard or Furumochi teaches or suggests a voltage voltage control circuit comprising a clamp circuit having a clamp threshold" in pages 3 and 4, the total threshold voltage of Furumochi's diodes is the clamp threshold of the clamp circuit.

In response to the statements in page 4, second paragraph through page 5, as switch (SWO(TN4)) of Furumochi closed, the total threshold of the clamp circuit is approximately at three threshold voltages which is lower than the original threshold value of the clamp circuit which is four threshold voltages. Thus, the Furumochi's figure 5 meets the limitation "at least one bypass device...from the clamp circuit to lower the clamp threshold of the clamp circuit".

In response to the statement "Nowhere does Furumochi teach or suggest the step of reversibly bypassing at least one of the plurality of voltage control elements". As switch (SWO(TN4)) of Furumochi's figure 5 closed the current from diode T4 reversibly going through switch (SWO(TN4)). Therefore, it can be considered as reversibly bypass diode T4.

Similar arguments for the statements of page 7 through 9 of the Remarks.